

RICHMOND:—PRINTED (ON TUESDAYS AND FRIDAYS) BY SAMUEL PLEASANTS, JUNIOR, PRINTER TO THE COMMONWEALTH.

[Four Dollars Per Annum—paid in Advance.]

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1806.

[12 1-2 Cents Single.]

## NOTICE.

THE PARTNERSHIP OF  
**Macmurdo & Fisher,**  
WILL terminate with the 31st day of December next. The affairs of the company, after that period, will remain in the hands of Charles J. Macmurdo for settlement.

CHARLES J. MACMURDO.  
GEORGE FISHER.  
Richmond, Nov. 14, 1806. tJan.

## Thirty Dollars Reward.

DESERTED from this place, on the 14th inst. JAMES LOWNES, a soldier of the public guard, about 28 years of age, five feet 7 or 8 inches high, fair complexion, with red hair and large whiskers, with blue eyes. It is unknown where he will go, as he is very fond of spirits. Any person taking up said deserter and bringing him to this place, and delivering him to me, or either of the officers of the said guard, shall receive the above reward.

ALEX. QUARRIER, C. P. G.  
N. B. All masters of vessels are forewarned from carrying him out of this place.  
A. Q.  
Richmond, Nov. 18th, 1806.

## WILL BE SOLD,

TO the highest bidder, for ready money, at John Anderson's tavern, in the town of New-Canton, on Thursday the 18th December next,

## One Negro Woman

Named Aggey, made over to us in trust, to secure the payment of a debt due from Charles Mathews to Walter Irvine.

Samuel Bradford, } Trustees.  
John Irvine, }

New-Canton, Nov. 17th, 1806.  
ALSO, at the same time and place, a likely NEGRO LAD, about 17 or 18 years of age, for Cash.

Walter Irvine.

## Humanity Hall Grammar School,

WILL be continued by the Subscriber, for the ensuing term, for the instruction of youth, in the Greek, Latin and English languages; Geography, the elements of Geometry, with practical Surveying—ALSO, Writing and Arithmetic, Vulgar, Decimal and Analytical. The price of board, tuition, washing and fuel, will be twenty-eight pounds for the term, paid quarterly in advance, to commence on the 15th of January next, and expire the 10th of December. Particular attention will be paid to the morals, deportment and cleanliness of the youth; and bedding will be furnished such as choose at forty shillings extra. The subscriber having lately erected a convenient House, it will be in his power to furnish twelve or fifteen boys with good accommodations.

THOMAS NELSON.  
Forks of Hanover, Nov. 15, 1806. 4c

## NOTICE.

I AM prepared to receive Members of the Assembly as

## BOARDERS,

At the House occupied by me last year, near the Capitol. Gentlemen who lodge with me, shall have the privileges of private Boarding-Houses, and I will exert myself to give general satisfaction.

JOHN MOODY.  
Nov. 20, 1806. 2t  
Manchester Turnpike Company.

NOTICE is hereby given, that the annual meeting of Stock-holders, will be held at Mr. Brooks' Tavern, in Manchester, on the first Monday in December next, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

JAMES BRANDER, CLK.  
November 12th, 1806. 4m

## NOTICE.

BY virtue of a deed of trust executed by Edward Lewis, of Buckingham county, to George S. Hare, of said county, and John Erwin, of Pendleton county, to secure the payment of four hundred dollars, due from said Lewis to Thomas Peebels, of Fayette county, and state of Kentucky, will be SOLD, on the tenth day of January next, in the town of Duquidville, Buckingham county,

## One Negro Man

Named Charles, the property of said Lewis, to satisfy the said debt. The sale will begin at 10 o'clock in the forenoon—due attendance will be given by

JOHN ERWIN,  
One of the trustees.  
Nov. 9th, 1806. 3w

## The Subscriber,

THINKS proper to give notice, he has resumed the practice of the law, and purposes regular attendance in the Court of Appeals, the Federal Court, and the High Court of Chancery, holden in the city of Richmond, (to which place he is now preparing to remove his residence.) Due attention will be paid to such business as may be committed to his care.

WILLIAM COWAN.  
Lunenburg, Nov. 14. 4f

The Grand Lodge of Virginia will meet at the Masons' Hall, in this city, on the evening of the second Monday in the next month.

W. H. FITZWHYLLSON, G. S.  
Richmond, Nov. 17, 1806. 18D

## FOR SALE.

BY virtue of a decree of the county court of Albemarle, made in the case of Micajah Chiles' executors against Menan Mills, WILL BE SOLD FOR CASH on the premises, on Friday the 19th day of December, 1806,

## A Tract of Land,

Lying in the county of Albemarle, situated about 11 or 12 miles above the town of Charlottesville, and about two or three from the late dwelling of Richard Woods, and on the road leading from Charlottesville to Amherst courthouse, in a healthy neighborhood, and is well calculated for a Farm. Also by virtue of the same decree, will be sold for cash on the premises, on Saturday the 20th day of December 1806, A LOT OF GROUND with the improvements thereon, in the town of Charlottesville, being the Lot formerly the property and dwelling of the late Micajah Chiles, deceased—the improvements consist of a Dwelling-House two story high, three or four rooms below stairs, and several rooms on the second story; on this lot is also an Office-House, Stable, and several other convenient out-houses.

Martin Dawson, } Commissioners.  
Charles Yancy, }  
David I. Lewis, }  
Alex. Garrett. } tds

I TAKE this opportunity of informing my friends and the public, that I shall open my House as a private

## Boarding House,

And shall be well prepared to receive about twenty Members of the next Assembly. My House is among one of the most convenient stands—it is situated between the Bank and Barracks, and adjoining the Capitol square. I have also an excellent Stable for eighteen Horses. The price of board will be as low as the markets will admit, both for gentlemen and their horses—no pains will be spared to give satisfaction.

JOHN P. SHIELDS.  
Nov. 10. w3t

Powhatan county court, October 16th, 1806.

Alexander Marshall, executor & heir, or devisee of Mary Mary Marshall, deceased, Plaintiff.

AGAINST  
Josiah Thompson, executor of Josiah Thompson, deceased, who was administrator of Patience Thompson, deceased, and Thomas Watkins, Defendants.

THIS day came the plaintiff by John Lane, esquire, his attorney, and the defendant Josiah Thompson not having entered his appearance and given security according to law and the rules of this court, and it appearing to the satisfaction of the court that the said defendant is not an inhabitant of this state; therefore, on the motion of the plaintiff by his attorney aforesaid, It is ordered, that the said defendant Josiah Thompson, appear here on the third Wednesday in February next, and answer the plaintiff's bill; and that a copy of this order be forthwith inserted in some newspaper printed in the city of Richmond for two months successively, and that another copy be posted at the front door of the courthouse of this county for two successive court days.

A copy—Teste,  
JAMES POINDEXTER, CLK.

## NOTICE.

THOSE having claims against the estate of Jeremiah Rawlins, dec. are requested to exhibit them to Wm. Gay, of Caroline county, or Henry Rawlins, of Buckingham, on or before Caroline January court—as this notice will be plead in bar against all after that time; and those indebted to the said estate, are desired to make immediate payment, as suits will be instituted indiscriminately, if they fail to do so.

HENRY RAWLINS, Ex'r.  
November 17, 1806. w4t

## FOR SALE.

54 low priced Silver Watches  
1 elegant Gold Repeating Watch  
500 lbs. Seine Twine  
2000 lbs. best German Steel  
A large additional supply of IRON-MON-GERY and HARD-WARE, just received by

BREAM & FOLLET.  
Richmond, Nov. 17, 1806. w2

BY virtue of a deed of trust executed to me by Charles Craddock, to secure the payment of a sum of money therein mentioned, will be SOLD to the highest bidder for cash, at Amelia courthouse, on Monday the 8th day of December, TWO FEMALE SLAVES, to wit: Sally and Dicy.

EDMOND EGLESTON.  
Nov. 15, 1806. w2

FOR SALE AT S. PLEASANTS' BOOK STORE,

## HENING'S

New Virginia Justice,  
Containing the Duties of a Justice of Peace, &c. together with a variety of useful precedents, adapted to the laws now in force. Also, forms of conveyancing, such as deeds of bargain and sale, lease and release, mortgage, trust, &c.

## Foreign Intelligence,

Via Norfolk.

Continuation of Translations from Paris papers received at the Office of the Public Ledger, by the Ship William Penn, Captain Watson, in 42 Days from Nantes.

## ASSEMBLY OF THE JEWS IN PARIS.

PARIS, Sept. 11.  
The German papers, having most strangely perverted the answers given by the Synod of the Jews convened in Paris, more particularly those given to the third and sixth questions, we have to gratify a number of our subscribers republished all the answers, as we have obtained them from a well informed correspondent.

(Journal des Commerce.)  
1st Question.—Is a plurality of wives permitted to the Jews?

Ans.—It is not lawful for the Jews to take more than one wife. They generally comply with the laws of the European states in which they reside, and those forbidding polygamy, the Jews comply with those laws.

Moses did not expressly command to marry more than one, neither did he forbid it. It would appear that taking it for granted that such a thing would happen, he regulates the portions of children of different wives. Although polygamy was tolerated in the East, the ancients proscribed to the Jews not to marry more than one woman, unless their substance afforded the means of providing for more, and their issue. It was different in the west, where desirous of conforming to the usages of the nations among which they settled, the Jews generally renounced polygamy. Some few individuals however still following that practice, a Synod was convened at Worms in the 11th century, in which the Rabbi Guershon presided, composed of 100 Rabbies. This assembly pronounced an anathema against every Israelite, who should thereafter marry more than one woman, this prohibition, seconded by the influence of European manners and laws, has been obeyed ever since.

2d Question.—Does the religion of the Jews admit of divorce? is such a divorce considered as conclusive, when at variance with the laws of France?

Ans.—Divorce is allowed by the law of Moses, but it is not valid unless previously decided by the tribunals according to the laws of France. Submission to the laws of the Prince, is the first duty of all Jews, & if it is a fundamental maxim adopted among them, that in whatever relates to civil and political concerns, the laws of the state shall be paramount. Before they entered in France the same rights as other citizens, and when by special acts of the state, which permitted them to govern themselves in conformity with their religious customs, they had the liberty of divorcing their wives; it was however very rarely used. Since the Revolution they have entirely conformed to the French laws; and when admitted to the rights of Citizenship, the Rabbies and principal Jews of France appeared before the local municipalities, and took the oath, strictly to conform in all things to the laws of France, and to have no other rule in the adjustment of their civil concerns. Thus they can no longer consider divorce pronounced by their Rabbies and valid, since to do so it must be previously pronounced by the civil tribunals of the state.

Inasmuch as the Rabbies, by a decree of the Consuls, were forbidden to administer the marriage ceremony, unless the parties could show that they were previously married by a municipal officer, so in like manner they cannot pronounce divorce, unless previously pronounced by the civil authority. If even this decree did not decide the point, the sentence of the Rabbies would not be valid, as the law in regard to civil concerns, would be superior, to which either of the parties would have the right of appealing; from all which it results that the sentence of the Rabbi, without the sanction of the civil law, cannot be valid. And it is further evident, that since the Jews marry before the civil magistrate, that no Jew, who respects his religion can repudiate his wife, unless by double divorce, and on which account it is asserted that the law of Moses, is perfectly conformable to the civil law.

3d Question.—May a Jewess marry a Christian, or a Christian woman marry a Jew? or does the law allow them only to marry among themselves?

Ans.—The laws does not say, that a Jewess shall not marry a Christian, nor a Christian woman, a Jew; neither does it declare that the Jews can only marry among themselves. The law forbids only marriages with the seven Canaan nations, with Ammon, Moab and the Egyptians. The prohibition with the seven nations is absolute, that respecting Ammon and Moab is according to the laws of the Talmud, confined to the men, and not to the women, but it is believed that the latter ought to have embraced the Jewish religion. The law concerning the Egyptians is confined to the third generation. The prohibition is strictly applicable to the nations who worship idols. The Talmud declares formally, that the modern nations are not idolaters, seeing that they, as we do, worship the Lord God of heaven and earth, hence many marriages have taken place between Jews and Christians, in France, Spain and Germany. These marriages were permitted or prohibited by the Princes in whose kingdoms or states the Jews resided, some such marriages are to be found in France at present, yet we cannot conceal that these mar-

riages are against the opinion of the Rabbies; according to their tenets it is held that in the acceptance of the Talmud, a marriage requires religious ceremonies called Kidushin, and the nuptial blessings, and as no marriage is valid in point of religion, if the said ceremonies are not performed, it is evident that no such marriage can take place between two individuals who should not both consider the said ceremony sacred: in which case they might separate again without being under the necessity of applying to their church for divorce. They would be considered as civilly, but not religiously married. Such is the opinion of the Rabbies, members of the assembly, and they would in general be not more inclined to celebrate the nuptials of a Christian woman with a Jew, or of a Jewess, than the Roman Catholic priests would be disposed to consecrate such a marriage.

The Rabbies however confess that a Jew who marries a Christian woman does not therefore cease to be a Jew in the opinion of his co-religionists, the same as he who marries a Jewess civilly and not according to the precepts of the religion.

4th Question.—Do the Jews consider Frenchmen as brothers, or as foreigners?

Ans.—The Jews consider Frenchmen as brothers, and not as foreigners, and which mode of considering them is in conformity with the principles of the law of Moses.

At the time when the Israelites existed as a nation, their legislator, prescribed to them, to love the stranger as their brother, "remember, said he to them, that you have been strangers in Egypt." Respect and kindness towards strangers, are not only recommended by Moses, as a mere practical duty of social morality, but commanded by God himself. "When getting in your harvest, said he to them, do not go back to gather the gleanings leave them for poor strangers, and the widow, do not ill-treat the stranger, do him no injury, love him as thyself, and give him bread, supply him with clothing, if he want, I am the Everlasting, your God, the Everlasting lover of strangers."

To these sentiments of benevolence Moses adds, the love of mankind in general. "Love thy equal as thyself." David also expresses himself, "The Lord our God is all goodness, his mercy extends over all his works."

A Talmadist says, "we are obliged to love as brothers, to visit the sick, to bury the dead, and to assist the poor of the stranger, the same as if they were Israelites, whatever may be their opinions. There is in truth no act which a true Israelite ought not to perform towards a stranger." His principles, are, to forsake idolatry, not to blaspheme, not to commit adultery, not to kill or wound a fellow creature, not to rob, nor deceive, and to maintain justice. All our principles therefore make it a duty for us to love the French as brothers.

A pagan once required of the Rabbi Hille, information respecting the Jewish religion, and to be briefly informed of its principles. He received the following reply "Do not to thy fellow creature that which thou would not should be done unto thee." This is the true religion, the rest is but consequence. A religion which prescribes to love the stranger, which recommends the practice of all the social virtues, enjoins us to love a fellow citizen as a brother. How can we consider them otherwise? we inhabit the same soil, we are ruled and protected by the same government, enjoy the same privileges, and fulfil the same duties.

There is between the Jew and the Christian another tie on the former, effacing the recollection of any difference of religion; that of gratitude, inspired by a free tolerance of our religion, which in addition to other favors, has acquired such force, that we cannot avoid joining our destiny with that of France. Yes, France is our native Country, and Frenchmen are our brothers. This glorious title, while it gives us more estimation in our own minds, is a pledge that we shall never cease to deserve it.

5th Question.—What are the relations, which the law prescribes to the French, who are not of the Jewish creed?

Ans.—The relations are the same as from one Jew to another. We acknowledge no other difference, but that of worshipping God, each in his own, and we believe this differing does not displease the God of heaven and earth. The answer to the preceding question shows the relation which the law of Moses, the Talmud, prescribe to us with the French who are not of our religion. And now since the Jews are no more a distinct nation, and since they enjoy the advantage of being incorporated into the great nation, which they consider as a political redemption, it is impossible that a Jew can consider a Frenchman who is not of his religion, different from one of his religion.

6th Question.—Do the Jews who are born in France, and who are treated by the law, as French citizens, consider France as their native country, and are they obliged to defend her?

Ans.—Men who have adopted a country in which they have resided during several generations, who under the restraints of particular laws which abridged their civil rights, and who had affection enough for that country, to prefer the misfortune of not partaking the rights and privileges of the other citizens, to that of leaving her, cannot now consider themselves in France but as Frenchmen. The obligation of defending her appears to them a duty both honorable and natural. Jeremiah, chap. 29, "tells the Jews to consider Babylon as their native country, although they were to remain there but seventy years. He recommends to them to clear the land, to build houses, to sow and plant." They fol-

lowed his advice in such a manner, that Esdras, chap. 1, says "that when Cyrus gave them leave to return to Jerusalem, in order to rebuild the second temple, no more than 40,360 left Babylon, and that these were chiefly *proletaire*, all the rich having remained in that city. The love of the Jews for their country, is a feeling so natural and so ardent, and so much unconcerned with their religious faith, that a French Jew when in England, although in the midst of other Jews, considers himself as a stranger, and that the same takes place when an English Jew comes to France. This feeling prevails so much against the spirit of the religion, that French Jews have been seen in the late wars fighting to the utmost against German Jews, who were opposed to them. A great number of them bear honorable scars, and have given in the field glorious proofs of their valor.

7th Question.—How are the Rabbies appointed?

Ans.—Since the revolution, in all places where the Jews are sufficient in number to support a Rabbi, he is chosen by the heads of families, who examine into his morality, and capacity.

8th Question.—What jurisdiction of police had the Rabbies over the Jews? have they any judicial jurisdiction among themselves?

Ans.—The Rabbies have no jurisdiction of police over the Jews. The term Rabbi is found nowhere in the law of Moses, nor did it exist in the time of the first temple; the first mention of Rabbi is to be found towards the end of the second temple. The Jews were governed in those days by Sanhedrins or tribunals. There was one superior tribunal called the grand Sanhedrin, which held its sittings in Jerusalem, and was composed of 71 Judges. There were inferior tribunals, for police and civil affairs, these were composed of three judges, and there was another tribunal composed of 23 judges, which determined matters of more importance, and were called the inferior Sanhedrins. The term of Rabbi is noticed for the first terms in the *Misna* and *Talmud*, and is there used to denote a Doctor of Laws, hence a man who was learned was commonly called Rabbi. After being dispersed, the Israelites formed small communities in those places where they were permitted to settle, and there a Rabbi, assisted by two doctors, called *Headim*, formed a tribunal and decided matters relative to the Jews. The Rabbi was president, and the doctors were judges or assistants. These tribunals however, were at all times, held under the permission and pleasure of the government under which they lived, that is, they had no independent judiciary.

None of these tribunals of Rabbies, are to be found at this time in France or Italy since the Revolution. The Jews after that epocha became citizens, and conformed themselves in all things to the laws of the State. The functions of the Rabbies in the places where they are established, are confined to the duties of preaching, celebrating marriages and pronouncing divorces. In places where there is no Rabbi, any Jew learned in his religion, may agreeable to the law consecrate a marriage, without the assistance of a Rabbi, which is an inconsistency, the evil consequences of which ought to be remedied, by extending the prohibition of the Rabbies, made by the arrête of the Consuls to every other person, who may be applied to, to consecrate a marriage. As for what concerns the judiciary police among themselves, they can have none since there is no constituted ecclesiastical hierarchy nor any subordination of religious functions.

9th Question.—Are those forms of election and the jurisdiction of those tribunals, directed by law, or merely established by custom?

Ans.—The replies made to the two former questions, make any reply to this unnecessary. It may only be observed, that supposing the Rabbies to possess any judicial jurisdiction at this time (the contrary of which is the fact) or that there are any particular form of election, they must be the effect of custom, and not by the authority of law.

10th Question.—Are there any professions, which the laws of the Jews forbid?

Ans.—There are none: on the contrary to the Talmud (*Kiduschim*, chap. 1) declares positively that the father of a family, who does not bring up his child to a trade, brings him up to be a highwayman.

11th Question.—Does the law of the Jews forbid them to take usury of their brethren?

Ans.—Deuteronomy, chap. 23, verse 19, "you shall not lend on interest to your brother, neither money, nor grains, nor any thing whatsoever."

The Hebrew word *nechel*, which has been translated by the word *usury*, has wrongly been explained. It signifies in the Hebrew tongue, "any interest," and not an usurious interest: It has not, therefore, the signification which is now applied to the word *usury*. It is even impossible that it could have that signification, for that expression is relative, and there is nothing in the text which expresses its relation.

What do we understand by the French word *usury*; is it not an interest higher than the rate fixed by law?

If the law of Moses has not fixed that rate is it possible that the Hebrew word should signify an illegal interest?

The word *Nechel* is in the Hebrew tongue, what the word *Rebus* is in the Latin.

In order therefore to induce one to believe that this word signifies *usury*, there ought to be another word which would signify interest; and since that word does not exist all interest is *usury*, and all *usury* is interest. What view may the legislator have had, when he forbade the Hebrews to take interest from one another? It was cer-